REMARKS

Claims 1-25 of the present application remain pending. Claims 1, 11, and 19 are amended herein. No new material is added as a result of the claim amendments. The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter regarding Claims 7, 14, and 22.

DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to for not providing legends for symbolically illustrated structure in Figure 1. A drawing amendment providing legends for the structure of Figure 1 is filed herewith. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request review and approval of the drawings.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Ranf et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,486,847), hereinafter referred to as "Ranf." The Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 is not anticipated by Ranf. For example, Claim 1 of the present invention recites an input detection system for an electronic device comprising, " a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with the surface of said electronic device." Claims 11 and 19 recite similar claim

limitations. The Applicants respectfully submit that this claim limitation is neither taught nor suggested by Ranf. The recited claim limitation is supported on page 18, lines 4-11 of the specification which recite (emphasis added):

> In one embodiment, sensor 510 is an inductive sensor which is able to detect an object at a distance from the sensor itself and through intervening layers such as the Spiral ® inductive sensor which is commercially available from Synaptics Inc. of San Jose, CA. In one embodiment, stylus 415 contains, for example, an inductor and a capacitor which will interfere with an inductive field emanating from sensor 510 and is registered as an input to portable computer system 200. A user can indicate an input to portable computer system 200 without actually touching the display surface with stylus 415.

The recited claim limitation is further supported on page 20, lines 6-17 which recite (emphasis added):

> In another embodiment, sensor 510 is a capacitive sensor such as the MultiTouch sensor which is commercially available from FingerWorks Incorporated of Newark, DE. The MultiTouch sensor is capable of remotely detecting, (e.g., in proximity to but not touching the sensor itself), the presence of an electrically conductive material (e.g. metal or a user's finger). Previous capacitive sensors were able to detect electrical conductors only when they were touching a protective cover above the capacitor. However, advances in the technology have created sensors with much greater sensitivity which are able to detect the electrical conductors at a distance up to an inch from the sensor and through an intervening non-metallic material. A user can make an indication above the surface of the display which can be registered by sensor 510 as an input to portable computer system 200.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ranf teaches away from the recited claim limitation in column 3, lines 28-37 (emphasis added):

> The protective transparent plate 12 is made of glass, Lexan or some similar material that is transparent and resists scratches. This material must be scratch resistant not only to resist inadvertent scratches during transportation, but also because data entry may be by writing upon the top surface of the transparent protective plate 12 with a stylus.

The Applicants respectfully submit that this is clearly shown in Figure 2 of Ranf as well. The Applicants respectfully submit that the input detection system recited in embodiments of the present invention is less prone to scratches than the system shown by Ranf. As recited by Ranf in column 4, lines 1-15, a user is required to contact the protective plate 12 in order for the digitizer 20 to detect the reflected electromagnetic field. Because the sensor of the present invention can detect an indication that is not in contact with the surface of the electronic device, a user does not need to physically contact the sensor when operating the electronic device. Additionally, operating the electronic device is possible in embodiments of the present invention without the necessity of a stylus which is convenient because, due to its small size, a stylus can be easily misplaced. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claim limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 11 and 19 of the present invention are not anticipated or suggested by Ranf. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are overcome.

Claim 2 depends from independent Claim 1 and recites further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is also overcome.

Claims 1, 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Murakami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,988,837), hereinafter referred to as "Murakami." As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Murakami does not teach or suggest an input detection system for an electronic device as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 of the present invention comprising:

a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with the surface of said electronic device."

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Murakami teaches away from the present invention in column 12, lines 43-46 (emphasis added):

Consequently, a line which is substantially the same as the line along which a character or figure is written with the pen 2 on the liquid crystal display panel 50 superposed on the sensing section 10....."

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claim limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 11 and 19 of the present invention are not anticipated or suggested by Murakami. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 1 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are overcome.

Claim 4 depends from independent Claim 1 and recites further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is also overcome.

Claims 1, 4 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Garwin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,218,173), hereinafter referred to as "Garwin." As discussed above, the Applicants respectfully submit that Garwin does not teach or suggest an input detection system for an electronic device as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 of the present invention comprising:

a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with the surface of said electronic device."

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Figure 1 of Garwin clearly shows stylus 16 in contact with writing surface 10 which teaches away from the recited claim limitations of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claim limitations recited in independent Claims 1, 11 and 19 of the present invention are not anticipated or suggested by Garwin. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 1 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are overcome.

Claim 4 depends from independent Claim 1 and recites further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to Claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is also overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3, 5-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20-21, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ranf or Garwin in view of Saw et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,445,574), hereinafter referred to as "Saw."

As discussed above, neither Ranf nor Garwin teach or suggest the claim limitations recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 of the present invention. Specifically, neither Ranf nor Garwin teach or suggest an input detection system for an electronic device comprising:

> a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to but not in contact with the surface of said electronic device."

Saw does not overcome the shortcomings of Ranf and/or Garwin. Specifically, Saw does not teach or suggest a sensor component operable to detect an indication in proximity to by not in contact with the surface of an electronic device as recited in independent Claims 1, 11, and 19 of the present invention. Instead, Saw teaches in column 3, lines 40-44 (emphasis added):

> a sensor, typically an electromagnetic relay or cam actuated switch, is coupled to processor 31.
> In use, sensor 48 provides a signal to processor 31, this signal being indicative of the cover 12 being in the open or closed position.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1, 11, and 19 are not taught or suggested by Ranf alone or in combination with Garwin and/or Saw. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 11, and 19 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 3, 5-6, and 8-10 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 3, 5-6, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are overcome.

Claims 12-13, and 15-18 depend from independent Claim 11 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 12-13, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

Claims 20-21, and 23-25 depend from independent Claim 19 and recite further limitations descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the objections to Claims 20-21, and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are also overcome.

CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-26 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. The Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S 6,466,292, U.S. 5,889,236, U.S. 5,381,160.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 2/8/2004

Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060